G. R. S. 58]

Previous references.

S.R File No. 176 of 02

1902-03

Serial Nos. 1-2

(Excise)

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1 - 2.

Major Part B for July

SUBJECT.

Inamdar's claim to the toddy revenue of Jodi Chick Kalasapura village

From Excise Commissioner No. 1894/538 dt. 20-6-03

Submits with opinion the records of enquiry relating to the toddy revenue of the village

2. To Excise Commissioner, Comptroller in Mysore } No. 63-4 Ex. 13-01 dt. 28-7-03.

GPB—5,000—22-10-10

Disallows the Inamdar's claim to the toddy revenue

HCC

Ex 87/3/0

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
14050
1903

From A. V. Kumaraya Esq. B.A.
Excise Commissioner,
in Mysore.

To
A. V. Kanjundayya Esq. B.A. B.L.
Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore
General and Revenue Departments.

Dated 20th
Despatched 30th } June 1903.
Received

General No. 7879
No. 538

S.R. 176302

Enclosure No. one file

Submits his opinion
the record of enquiry relating
to the Toddy Revenue of Jodi
Chick Kalasapura village in
Chickmagalur taluk.

Seen
30/6/03

Received
9/7/03.

No 7896/538 Revenue file. Excise Commissioner's Office

Dated, Bangalore 20th/30th June 1903.

From

B. N. Srinivasa Esquire B.A.

Excise Commissioner in Mysore.

To

M. V. Nanjundayya Esquire M.A. M.L.

Secretary to the Government of

His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore

General and Revenue Departments.

Sir,

In submitting herewith the record of enquiry relating to the Toddy Revenue of Dodi Chick Kalasapura village, Chick magalur taluk, I have the honor to state that the present Deputy Commissioner Mr Narayanrao in para 6 of his letter no 198, dated 21st May 1903/9th June 1903, says that the Maundars of this village have failed to appear before him though duly served with notice; that decision has already been passed by Mr Sparkes to the effect that the Maundars are not entitled to the Toddy Excise Revenue; and that by Mr Narayanrao adds Rent Register of this village does not make any

any mention of the Toddy Revenue. I concur in Mr Sparkes' opinion that the Jodidars are not entitled to Excise Revenue from Toddy. There is no toddy shop, but there are a few toddy trees in occupied lands. These trees were not sold by Government under the "Farming System", and therefore no money is payable to the Jodidars by Government. Neither does the Sannad nor the Inam Settlement concede Excise Revenue to them. The Muchalikas produced by them, show that they leased their toddy trees and derived tree-rent from them. They claim on the same rights as occupants of Government lands have over their toddy trees. Accordingly they are entitled only to enjoy the rent of the trees leased by them for drawing toddy.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
your most obedient servant

J M Murray Jr

Excise Commissioner
in Mysore.

In the Court of the Deputy Commissioner
Kadur District

Government of - Inamdars of Chik Kalasa
pur village
Mallappiah &c

The following are the enquiry and result of
the Proceedings regarding the claims for Poddy
Revenue of Chik Kalasapur village
Chikmagalur Taluk —

The Statement is as follows - —

Statement of Mallapiah, Ramappa.

Sitha Ramchaitri, Sitha Ramia
Thimmappia, Linyappa.
Soldiers of Chick Sulapen.
Duly sworn We claim the total
revenue on the following grounds.
long enjoyment & produce the
following documents to prove it.
1/4 Unattested copy of Sanad original
being lost.
2/4 Umlehabitha executed by
Timmi Gowda dated 1882, & then in
1886 & the assessment to be 10 pon
Rs 2/- for 1882 & Rs 4/12/- for 86
The contract was made previous
to 1882 as the trees only then became
matured.
The land was only renewed every
third year. The average was abt
2a per tree ~~for three years each year~~.
There are abt ~~200~~ 100 trees which will
yield Rs abt ~~Rs 2/-~~ 12/- for the three years
or Rs ~~8/6/6~~ 4/2/8 per annum.
The Sulapen Shop has been rented
for three years. Two more shops have
been opened out since 92/93
All the trees are situated in occupied
lands & there are no waste lands
& we claim the same rights as
ryots occupying Govt lands.
Read over & explained & the same
20/11/94 Sitt Sparks

The petitioner claims that Lordship should: on the plea of long occupancy or mine & proves it produces receipts or muchalikas for contractors paid 12½ old price duty: they say that the Customs Lord Lowndes & Co. The Secretary of the receipts being paid 12½ old makes it very suspicious whether it is genuine or not. As regards the unauthenticated copy of their demand produced, it makes no mention whatsoever of the Lordship: also it mentions other items such as 'Aqua duty' 'Wool Naval coir' 'water coir' etc. Under the circumstances I am of opinion, that the petitioners are not entitled to the Customs claimed for Lordship.

H H Sparke
28/11/94

ಸಂಗಮೇಶ್ವರ ಬಸವೇಶ್ವರ ಕಾಯಕಯೋಗಿ ಸಂತ ಶಿರೋಮಣಿ —

ಶರಣ ಕಾಯಕಯೋಗಿ

ಸನ್ 1882 ನೇ ಇಸವಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂತ್ಯವಾಗುವ ಹಾಗೆ

[illegible]

Urgent (2 words)

46 Krishnappa
47. Lingappaiya

Extract from the Quit rent register of Chikkalasa

Title deed no	Date on which Title-deed has been issued	Name of Inamdar	Description of Inam	Condition of grant	Description of land	Old extent	Former assessment	
2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
31/269	1.4.74.	Kalasapur village	Personal -	For personal benefit -				
		1. Kaeiya - ½						
		2 Lingappaiya						
		3. Rangamma						
		4. Subbamma						
		5. Sitaramaiya						
		bala Krishnamaniya						
		7 Ramaiya.						
		8. Subbamma						
		9 Ramaiya.						
		10. Anantharamaiya						
		11 Ranjappaiya } ½						
		12. Alekappa }						
		13. Venkaraiya } ½						
		14. Ramaiya }						
		15 Subbaiya 2						
		16. Kantaiya.						
		17 Kasaiya						
		18 Lingappaiya 2						
		19. Lakshmiranganna						
		20 Mallamma.						
		21. N. Srinivasachar 2						
		22. Sitaramsastri						
		23 Pattabhiramsastri 1						
		24. Kodandaramsastry						
		25. P. Narnappa ½						
		26. Tayamma ½						
		27. Kodandaramaiya						
		28. Narasimha						
		29 Subbamma						
		30 Krishnappa ½						
		31. Subbaiya.						
		32 Gopalaiya.						
		33. Sivaramaiya						
		34. Narasappa						
		35 Subbaiya.						
		36. Mallappaiya						
		37. Mallappa						
		38. Kasiya ½						
		39 Lingarasaiya						
		40. Subbaiya.						
		41. Sitaramaiya						
		42. Krishnappa						
		43. Mallappa. ½						
		44. Narnappa						
		45 Ramanna						
		46 Krishnappa						
		47. Lingappaiya						
		48. Ramaiya						
		49. Krishnappa						
		50. Sitaramaiya ½						
		51 Mallappaiya						

Register Showing the particulars required in Govern
Inam Villages in the Madura District

No 25

Names of Talukand Villages	Names of Inamdars	Extent of the Inam particulars as stated in the Inamdar's Title deed or other document relating to the Inam.	Remarks
Vedatchi Village	Ramaswamy Iyengar		
Chikkalapuram	Mallappiah Nanappa, Sellia Ramaswamy	The original Summud not produced and is stated to have been lost. The alleged copy of Summud is produced. The enclosure is not stated in it. The date of the grant is in the year 1832	If the conclusion is not exactly framed by Summud and on what circumstances it is claim
		The following claim item of revenue by long enjoyment supported by oral evidence as well as the lands being situated in their occupied lands as Government lands owners.	Amount of annual Inquest if any under the claim - Rs as account of years Revenue Rs 1891-92
		The amount of annual Inam made to Inamdar at 2 annas per every Rupee which amounts about Rs as 4-2-8.	
		The verbal statement of Vritty dar	He declaration which the information under which 5 is based
		About 100 trees	Probable Rent of Inam Lands, Gross Produce

ment proceedings No 6643-ST of the 11th July 1893) regarding the

What Sheriffs have been appointed by Khas Kee in 1892-93 and 93-94	What Sheriffs if any have been established within the village in 92-93 and 93-94.	The demand Collection and balance including Local Cess on account of Revenue by separate sale in 1892-93 & 93-94		
		Demand	Collection	Balance
Kalandrum	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil

Hindi 100 Tests

Deputy Commissioner
Kadur District

S. [illegible] 1264/02 39

Read:-

Letter no ~~[illegible]~~
7894 - 5388 dy 29/30 June
1903 from the Circle
Conservator regarding the record
of enquiry relative
to the inamdars'
claim to the levy
recovery of Jodi
Cheek Kalasapura
village in the
Cheekmagalur taluk,
Kadur District.

Order thereon:-

No 637
647/3-01
dy 28/7/03.

"The village has
no levy at present
has gone true. The
claim has investi-
gated by Mr Hankes
the Dy Comm ~~1894~~ 1894
who found upon
the evidence that

For approval
Hy
28/7/3

[illegible]
[illegible] Land Revenue

The Inamdars in this
case are clearly not-
entitled to levy
recovery.
I accordingly agree &
the draft.
19-7-03

before him that the
inamdars were
not entitled to the
three pensions from
today. When a
fresh enquiry
was held under
the Act of the 24/8/01
the inamdars failed to
effect a change then
Claim though notice
was duly served on them;
nor are they entitled
to this item of pension
either under the Inam
or by the Inam Settlement.
Govt. therefore held
that the inamdars'
right in this Case is admissible only
is only to the rent
~~is nothing more~~
~~than that of an~~
~~ordinary occupant~~
of Govt. land.

No money is preferred
to be payable to the
inamdars as they
pay were not

leased out by Govt

Sec 247.

To Mr Ennis Comm
in Mysore

Mr Constellation
Mgr

1903-04

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

EXCISE

PROCEEDINGS

Dated 28th July 1903

No. 63-4
Ex. F.13-01

Disallowing the Inamdars' claim to the toddy Excise revenue of Chik Kalasapura village in the Chikmagalur Taluk, Kadur District.

SBP—7-8-03—50

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, Excise, dated 28th July 1903.

READ—

Letter No. 7894—538, dated 20—30th June 1903, from the Excise Commissioner in Mysore, submitting the record of enquiry relating to the Inamdars' claim to the toddy revenue of Jodi Chik Kalasapura village in the Chikmagalur Taluk, Kadur District.

No. 63-4—Ex. F. 13-01, DATED BANGALORE, 28TH JULY 1903.

ORDER THEREON.—The village has no toddy shop but has some trees. The claim was investigated in 1894 by Mr. Sparkes, the Deputy Commissioner, who found upon the evidence then before him that the Inamdars were not entitled to the Excise revenue from toddy. When a fresh enquiry was held under the Government Order of the 2nd August 1901, the Inamdars failed to appear and prove their claim, though notice was duly served on them; nor are they entitled to this item of revenue, either under the Sannad or under the terms of the Inam Settlement. Government therefore hold that the Inamdars' right in this case is admissible only to tree-rent.

2. No money is reported to be payable to the Inamdars, as their trees were not leased out by Government.

H. V. NANJUNDAYYA,
Secy. to Govt., Gen. & Rev. Depts.

To—The Excise Commissioner in Mysore.
The Comptroller, Mysore Government.

Exd.—C.V.